



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,676	11/30/2006	Gunther Jakob Stark	102132-37	9641
27388	7590	02/26/2009	EXAMINER	
NORRIS, MC LAUGHLIN & MARCUS			WILSON, LEE D	
875 THIRD AVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
18TH FLOOR			3727	
NEW YORK, NY 10022				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/26/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/588,676	STARK, GUNTHER JAKOB	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	LEE D. WILSON	3727	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 8-18 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/06&amp;8/07</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                         |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Yonezawa et al (7168695).

Yonezawa et al discloses a quick action cylinder as recited in the claims.

Yonezawa et al discloses a quick action cylinder having a housing with a center bore (34), at least one locking member (15), a spring (35), a locking piston (11), at least one relief bore (surrounding element 44), and a pressure element (25a which is a valve, col 11, lines 65-68 and col 12, lines 1-3), and a control ring (44).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3727

4. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa et al (7168695).

- a. Yonezawa et al (7168695) discloses the claimed invention except for a diaphragm valve having a membrane and spring based valve.
- b. The claim would have been obvious because the design incentives or market forces provided a reason to make adaptation, since Yonezawa already discloses that different types of known valves can be used and to use diaphragm valve having a membrane and spring based valve would have made an invention resulting from application of prior knowledge in a predictable manner.

5. Claims 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark (7425000) in view of Yonezawa et al (7168695).

- c. Stark discloses discloses a quick action cylinder having a housing (fig.5) with a center bore (surrounding element 42), at least one locking member (19), a spring (8), a locking piston (42), at least one relief bore (top of bore), and a control ring (21).
- d. Stark does not discloses a pressure element.
- e. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art because Yonezawa et al discloses a quick action cylinder having a housing with a center bore (34), at least one locking member (15), a spring (35), a locking piston (11), at least one relief bore (surrounding element 44), and **a pressure element (25a which is a valve, col 11, lines 65-68 and col 12, lines 1-3)**, and a control ring

(44) and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

f. IN regard to claims 14-18, The claim would have been obvious because the design incentives or market forces provided a reason to make adaptation, since Yonezawa already discloses that different types of known valves can be used and to use diaphragm valve having a membrane and spring based valve would have made an invention resulting from application of prior knowledge in a predictable manner. Then it would have been obvious to pick these known elements to modify the modified Stark invention in view of Yonezawa et al and Design choice.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The 892 form discloses prior art being made of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE D. WILSON whose telephone number is 571-272-4499. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MONICA CARTER can be reached on 571-272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ldw

/LEE D WILSON/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3727

February 23, 2009